arXiv:0911.5162v1 [math.OC] 26 Nov 2009

©2009 A.M.Tsirlin

Maximum Principle for variational problems with scalar argument

A.M.Tsirlin
Program Systems Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences,
tsirlin@sarc.botik.ru

Abstract: In this paper the necessary conditions of optimality in the form of maximum principle are derived for a very general class of variational problems. This class includes problems with any optimization criteria and constraints that can be constructed by combining some basic types (differential equation, integral equations, algebraic equation, differential equations with delays, etc). For each problem from this class the necessary optimality conditions are produced by constructing its Lagrange function R and then by dividing its variables into three groups denoted as $u(t)$, $x(t)$ and a correspondingly. a are parameters which are constant over time. The conditions of optimality state that a non-zero vector function of Lagrange multipliers exists such that on the optimal solution function R attains maximum on u, is stationary on x, and the integral of R over the control period S can't be improved locally. Similar conditions are also obtained for sliding regimes. Here solution is given by the limit of maximizing sequence on which the variables of the second group are switching with infinite frequency between some (basic) values.

1. Introduction

The first formulation of the Pontryagin maximum principle was published in [1] for a problem of optimal high-speed response. The maximum principle was then extended to various other classes of variational and optimal optimal control problems, see for example [2–5]. For each of these new classes the new proof of the maximum principle was derived. Most of these proofs used Rozonoer approach [2], who published the first proper proof of the maximum principle based on using needle-like variations of control. The same proof was later used in Pontryagin's book [6], where the needle-shaped variations were called the Makstein variations. Pontryagin did not mention neither Boltyanskii's [1] nor Rozonoer's proofs, and did not acknowledge the crucial contribution of A.A. Fel'dbaum, who first stated the standard modern optimal control problem.

V.M. Tikhomirov repeatedly emphasized that it is desirable to consider various forms of optimal control problems within a unified framework by stating their optimality conditions in terms of the Lagrange function. This approach was implemented in [7] for the problems described by the ordinary differential equations.

In practice, the optimal control problems may also have many other types of constraints - integral equations, finite constraints, etc. The exact composition of these constraints may be very different in different parts of the control interval, etc.

In this paper we will use the canonical form of a variational problem [8, 9] that includes a wide class of constraints and objective functions. We will prove the maximum principle for the problem in this form. The known proofs of the maximal principle rely heavily on the link between the problem's state (phase) and its control variables via the problem's differential constraints. The approach used in this paper is based on using the particular type of relaxation of the canonical extremal problem. Similar approach was applied by L.S. Yang, V.F. Krotov, V.I. Gurman, R.V. Gamkrelidze, and others [10–13] to obtaine bounds (estimates) on the solutions of the particular types of extremal problems, to investigate sliding regimes and to derive the sufficient conditions of optimality.

When the particular problem from this class, with the particular type of constraints and the particular type of the optimality criterion, is considered, then this problem is reduced it to the canonical form. This yields the problem's Lagrange function R and defines which of its variables will belong to the first group and should maximize R on the optimal solution. Thus, adding new constraint not only changes (adds a new term to) the problem's Lagrange function, but it also changes for which variables it is required to maximize it.

2.Equivalent transformations and relaxations of extremal problems

An extremal problem is defined as a problem of finding the maximum of some criterion $I(y)$ on the feasible set D

$$I(y) \to \max \Big/ y \in D. \tag{1}$$

D can be a set in a vector space R^n or in a space of functions. The functional $I(y)$ is defined and bounded from above in D. The element $y^* \in D$, for which I attains maximum is called *the optimal solution*, and the value of criterion $I(y^*)$ is called *the value of the problem*. The set D can belong to the vector space R^n or to the space of functions. If the solution does not exist, then the value of the problem is the exact upper bound of the criterion ($\sup I(y)$) in D. In this case, the maximizing sequence is called the generalized solution.

2.1. Equivalent transformations

An extremal problem (1) can be transformed into another extremal problem. If the solutions of both the original and transformed problems are the same then the problems are called equivalent with respect to solutions. In their values coincide then they are called equivalent with respect to values. If both solutions and values are the same then the problems are said to be equivalent. Let us give a few examples of such transformations.

(1) Applying monotone function to criterion transforms (1) into the following problem

$$F_0(I(y)) \to \max \, / \, y \in D, \tag{2}$$

here F_0 is a monotonically increasing function (if F_0 is differentiable then its derivative on I is positive almost everywhere). The problem (2) is equivalent to (1) with respect to the solution.

(2) Adding vanishing term to the optimality criterion

$$I(y) + \varphi(y) \to \max \, / \, y \in D, \tag{3}$$

where the function $\varphi(y)$ is equal zero for any $y \in D$. The problem (3) is equivalent to the original one.

The concept of equivalent extremal problems can be generalized for problems where feasible sets of the original and transformed problems are different. Consider two extremal problems:

problem A : $\quad I_A(y) \to \max \,/\, y \in D_A$;

and problem $A1$: $\quad I_{A1}(z) \to \max \,/\, z \in D_{A1}$.

Definition 1. *The problems A and $A1$ are equivalent with respect to solution if such one-to-one mapping between D_A and D_{A1} can be found that from*

$$I_A(y_1) \geq I_A(y_2), \quad (y_1, y_2) \in D_A \tag{4}$$

it follows that

$$I_{A1}(z_1) \geq I_{A1}(z_2), \quad (z_1, z_2) \in D_{A1}. \tag{5}$$

Here z_1 is mapped onto y_1, and z_2 to y_2. We define the class of equivalent problems $\overline{A}$ as a set of all problem that are equivalent to A. The inequalities (4), (5) guarantee that the optimal solution of A corresponds to the optimal solution of $A1$.

Example. Suppose the problem A and $A1$ have the following forms

$$f_0(y) \to \max \Big/ f_0(y) \geq 0, \quad a \leq y \leq b$$

$$\int_a^b \sqrt{f_0(\tau)}\delta(t-\tau)d\tau \to \max \Big/ f_0(\tau) \geq 0.$$

here function f_0 is continuous and bounded on $[a, b]$. After introducing mapping of solutions of the problem A y^0 onto solutions of the problem $A1$ $\delta(y^0 - \tau)$ (where δ is the Dirac delta function), then $A1 \in \overline{A}$.

2.2. Relaxation of extremal problem

The method we use in this paper to solve extremal problems includes transformation of the original problem into another problem with the same criterion and a larger feasible set [10, 11]. The simplest transformation of this type can be obtained by deleting one of the original problem's constraints. It is clear that the new problem will have a wider feasible set. The other transformations that can be used here include adding time-dependent points to the feasible set of the original problem that includes only time-independent points, allowing discontinuous solution in addition to smooth ones, etc. All these methods transform the original problem into its relaxation.

Since the original extremal problem A corresponds to the entire class $\overline{A}$ of the equivalent transformed problems, we shall call any member of this class a relaxation of A (unlike the conventional definition of relaxation [11]).

Definition 1: *The problem B ($I_B(y) \to \max \;/\; y \in D_B$) is a relaxation of the problem A ($I_A(y) \to \max \;/\; y \in D_A$), if it is possible to single out such subset $\tilde{D}_B$ of D_B that the problem $\tilde{B}$ ($I_B(y) \to \max \;/\; y \in \tilde{D}_B$) is equivalent to the problem A with respect to the solution.* Therefore the problem $\tilde{B}$ belongs to the class $\overline{A}$.

Note that feasible sets D_A and D_B can have different nature. For example one can be a vector space and another a space of real functions. In the general case I_A and I_B can be also different but they obey the inequalities (4), (5) on D_A and $\tilde{D}_B$. In particular if D_A coincides with $\tilde{D}_B$ then I_A and I_B are either the same or one a is monotonic function of another on D_A.

Sometimes criteria and constraints that determine D depend on a parameter λ in such a way that for any $\lambda \in V_\lambda$ the problem B_λ is a relaxation of problem A. We shall call such relaxation $B_\lambda($ $I_B(\lambda, y) \to \max \;/\; y \in D_{B\lambda})$ a *parametric relaxation.*

Consider problem A: $I_A(y) \to \max \Big/ y \in D_A$ where a finite set of constraints determines D_A. Suppose for each of these constraints the norm Δ_j can be defined that measures its deviation from some nominal value (that is, from its value for the original problem).

Definition 2: *Problem is said to be well-posed if for any $\epsilon > 0$, δ exists such that from inequality $\max_j(\Delta_j) \le \delta$ it follows that the absolute value of the deviation of I^*_A for problem with constraints deviating from nominal values by δ_j from the problem's value when all constraints have zero nominal values $\delta_j = 0$ is less than ϵ.*

Definition 3: *Relaxation B: $I_B(y) \to \max \Big/ y \in D_B$ of the problem A is equivalent if*

$$I^*_{\overline{A}} = \sup_{y \in D_{\overline{A}}} I_{\overline{A}}(y) = \sup_{y \in D_B} I_B(y) = I^*_B. \tag{6}$$

Note that the left hand side of this equality does not depend on I^*_A and D_A, it depends on $I^*_{\overline{A}}$ and $D_{\overline{A}}$, that is, on the optimality criterion and feasible set for any problem from the class of equivalent relaxations of A.

Parametric relaxation is equivalent if equation (6) *holds for at least one* $\lambda \in V_\lambda$.

The following statements follow from these definitions:

Lemma 1: *The sufficient condition for relaxation to be equivalent to the original problem is that for any solution of relaxation problem* $y^0 \in D_B$ *it is possible to find a sequence* $\{y_i\} \subset D_A$ *of the feasible solutions of the original problem such that*

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} I_{\overline{A}}(y_i) = I_B(y^0). \tag{7}$$

For well-posed problems it is not necessary for $\{y_i\}$ to belong to $D_{\overline{A}}$. It is only necessary that in the limit $i \to \infty$ each of the constraints tends to nominal value with arbitrary accuracy. Lemma 1 follows from the definition 3. If optimal solution y^* of relaxation problem exists then y^0 can be replaced with y^*.

Lemma 2: *If* y^*_A *is the optimal solution of the problem* A, B *is an equivalent relaxation of* A *and* $D_B \supset D_A$, *then the necessary conditions of optimality for relaxation problem hold for* y^*_A.

Lemma 2 follows from the fact that y^*_A can not be improved on D_A, and D_A is a subset of the feasible set of the relaxation problem.

Relaxations are used

1) to reduce a conditional optimization problem to an unconditional problem,

2) to find approximate solution in a class of maximizing sequences if the problem does not have a solution in D,

3) to derive conditions of optimality and bounds on problem's value,

4) to construct computational algorithms.

The most widely used type of relaxation uses criteria I_A and I_B which have the same values on any element of D_A and on element that corresponds to it in $\tilde{D}_B$. If D_A and D_B are defined on the same space then D_A coincides with $\tilde{D}_B$ and $\forall y \in D_A \quad I_A(y) = I_B(y)$. For this type of relaxation the sufficient conditions of optimality (Krotov lemma [10]) holds. It states that the sufficient condition for y^* to be the solution of A is that y^* is a solution of relaxed problem B and y^* belongs to D_A.

If the initial problem has no solution, then its is sufficient for a sequence of feasible solutions of the initial problem to be problem's generalized solution (maximizing sequence) if this sequence approximates the solution of the relaxed problem with arbitrary accuracy.

3.Canonical form of the variational problem and optimality conditions for sliding regimes

3.1. Variational problem in the canonical form

We shall call canonical the following variational problem:

$$I = \int_0^T \Big[f_{01}(t, x(t), u(t), a) + \sum_l f_{02}(t, x(t), a)\delta(t - t_l) \Big] dt \to \max \tag{8}$$

subject the following conditions

$$J_j(\tau) = \int_0^T \Big[f_{j1}(t, x(t), u(t), a, \tau) + f_{j2}(t, x(t), a, \tau)\delta(t - \tau) \Big] dt = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$\forall \tau \in [0, T], \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad u \in V_u, \quad a \in V_a,$$

where a is vector of parameters that are constant on $[0, T]$; $u(t)$ and $x(t)$ are the piecewise continuous and the piecewise linear vector functions; values of $u(t)$ belong to the closed bounded set V in the space R^n; functions f_{j1} and f_{j2}, $j = 0, \dots, m$ are defined on direct product of the feasible sets of its two arguments, they are both continuously differentiable on x, a and t and f_{j1} are continuous on u.
$u(t)$ denote variables that are among the lists of parameters of the functions f_{j1} for $j = 0, 1, ..., m$ only (that is, f_{j2} are independent on $u(t)$). We shall them the variables of the first group.

Lemma 3: *Suppose the problem* (8), (9) *is well-posed with respect to problem's value (according to with definition 2, where the norm of deviation from the nominal value of every constraint* (9) *is defined as* $\Delta_j = \max_\tau |J_j(\tau)|$*), then the average relaxation of this problem*

$$\overline{I} = \int_0^T \Big[\overline{f_{01}(t, x, u, a)}^u + \sum_l f_{02}(t, x, a)\delta(t - t_l) \Big] dt \to \max \tag{10}$$

subject to

$$\overline{J}_j(\tau) = \int\limits_0^T \Big[\overline{f_{j1}(t,x,u,a,\tau)}^{u} + f_{j2}(t,x,a,\tau)\delta(t-\tau)\Big]dt = 0 \tag{11}$$

$$\forall\tau \in [0,T], \quad j = 1,\dots,m, \quad u \in V_\lambda, \quad a \in V_a$$

is equivalent to the problem (8), (9).

Here

$$\overline{f_{j1}}^{u} = \int\limits_{V_u} f_{j1}(t,x,u,a,\tau)P(u,t)du. \tag{12}$$

The probability density measure $P(u,t)$ obeys the condition

$$P(u,t) \geq 0, \quad \int\limits_{V_u} P(u,t)du = 1 \quad \forall t \in [0,T]. \tag{13}$$

This relaxation is obtained by replacing the control variable $u(t)$ with its mean value, that is, by applying randomization operation to $u(t)$. It was used by Yang [12] to study problems with differential constrains. It was also used by Krotov and Gamkrelidze to study sliding regimes in optimal control problems.

The proof of the Lemma 3 is given in the Appendix.

3.2. Optimality condition for sliding regimes

The unknown variables in the problem (10)–(11) is the measure $P^*(u,t)$, the vector function $x^*(t)$, and the vector a^* . The solution of this problem obeys the following condition.

Theorem 1 (optimality conditions for sliding regimes for the variational problem in the canonical form). *Suppose $P^*(u,t), x^*(t), a^*$ is the solution of the problem (10)–(11). Then*

1. *The optimal distribution of the randomized variables has the following form*

$$P^*(u,t) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t)\delta(u - u^\nu(t)), \tag{14}$$

where for all $\forall t \in [0,T]$ the piecewise continuous functions $\gamma_\nu(t)$ obey the condition $\gamma_\nu(t) \geq 0, \sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) = 1$.

2. *We can find a scalar* $\lambda_0 \geq 0$ *and a continuous vector function* $\lambda(\tau) = (\lambda_1(\tau), ..., \lambda_m(\tau))$, *which are not equal zero simultaneously with* λ_0 *on the interval* $[0, T]$ *and are equal zero outside it, such that for the functional*

$$S = \lambda_0 \overline{I} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_0^T \lambda_j(\tau) \overline{J_j}(\tau) d\tau = \int_0^T R dt \tag{15}$$

and its integrand

$$R = \lambda_0 R_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} R_j, \tag{16}$$

$$R_0 = \sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) f_{01}(t, x(t), u^\nu(t), a) + \sum_l f_{02}(t, x(t), a) \delta(t - t_l),$$

$$R_j = \int_0^T \lambda_j(\tau) \left[\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) f_{j1}(t, x(t), u^\nu, a, \tau) + f_{j2}(t, x(t), a, \tau) \delta(\tau - t) \right] d\tau \tag{17}$$

the following conditions hold

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta a} \delta a \leq 0, \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{\delta R}{\delta x} = 0, \tag{19}$$

$$u^\nu(t) = \arg\max_{u \in V_u} R(x, \lambda, a^*, u), \quad \nu = 0, ..., m, \tag{20}$$

where δa is an admissible variation of the parameter a.
$u^\nu(t)$ are called the *basic values* of the vector function u. Some of the conditions of the problem (10)–(11) may not contain variables of the first group; in this case, the maximal number of basic values is less than $m + 1$. The proof of the theorem is given in the Appendix.
Note that the relaxation (10)–(11) is equivalent to the original problem (8), (9). Therefore from Lemma 2 it follows that if the optimal solution $(u^*(t), x^*(t), a^*)$ of the initial problem exists in the class of piecewise continuous functions $u(t)$, then it satisfies the optimality conditions (18)–(20). In this case $\gamma_0(t) = 1$ and the remaining multipliers $\gamma_j(t)$ in (14) are equal to zero.

The optimality conditions of the problem (8), (9) takes the form (18)–(19) with

$$u^*(t) = \arg\max_{u \in V_u} R(x, \lambda, a^*, u), \tag{21}$$

where

$$R_0 = f_{01}(t, x(t), u(t), a) + \sum_l f_{02}(t, x(t), a)\delta(t - t_l), \tag{22}$$

$$R_j = \int_0^T \lambda_j(\tau)\Big[f_{j1}(t, x(t), u(t), a, \tau) + f_{j2}(t, x(t), a, \tau)\delta(\tau - t)\Big]d\tau. \tag{23}$$

Thus, for the variational problem in the canonical form (8), (9) the maximum principle conditions (18), (19), (21) hold, where the function R includes contributions from the optimality citerion R_0 and from each of the constraints $R_j, j = 1, 2, ..., m$.

4. Maximum principle for variational problems

4.1. Necessary conditions of optimality for sliding regimes

The theorem 1 ((18), (19), (21)) allows us to obtain the conditions of optimality in the form of maximum principle for problem with various types of criterion and constraints. This is done in two steps. Firstly, the problem under consideration is reduced to the canonical form as we it was done in the previous section, yielding R_0 term for criterion and R_j terms for of its constraints. Then the variables of the first group with respect to every one of these terms are singled out. The variables which belong to the first group with respect to all of these terms are denoted as $u(t)$. The maximum principle with respect to these variables (21) holds.

This process can be simplified if we derive contributions to R_0 and R_j from the standard types of optimization constraints and optimality criteria together with the rules showing how to classify problem's variables for each such contribution. These contributions and rules are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

We illustrate the derivation of such contributions to R for problem with constraints in the form of the ordinary differential equation

$$x(\tau) = x_0 + \int_0^\tau f(x(t), u(t), t)dt.$$

It can be rewritten using the δ function and the Heaviside step function $h(t)$ in the

Table 1.

Optimality criteria and the contibution to Lagrange function R from them

№	Optimality criterion $I \to \max$	Term R_0	Type of term
1	$\int_0^T f_0(y(t), a, t)dt$	$\lambda_0 f_0(y(t), a, t)$	R_{0I}
2	$F_0(y(t_0), a, t_0)$	$\lambda_0 F_0(y(t), a, t)\delta(t - t_0)$	R_{0II}
3	I= $\min\limits_{t\in[0,T]} f_0(y(t), a, t)$	$\frac{\lambda_0 I}{T} + \lambda(t)[I - f_0(y(t), a, t)]$ $\lambda(t) \le 0,$ $\lambda(t)[I^* - f_0(y(t), a, t)] = 0.$	R_{0II}

Note: If $I = \sum\limits_k a_k I_k$, then $R_0 = \sum\limits_k a_k R_{0k}$.

Table 2.

Basic types of constraints and their contributions to R

№	Kind of constraint	Term R_j	Type of term.
1	$\int_0^T f(y(t), a, t)dt = 0$	$\lambda f(y(t), a, t)$ at $t \in (0, T)$ 0 at $t \notin (0, T)$	R_j
2	$f(y(t), a, t) = 0,$ $\forall t \in (0, T)$	$\lambda(t) f(y(t), a, t)$ at $t \in (0, T)$ 0 at $t \notin (0, T)$	R_j
3	$f(y(t_0), a, t_0) = 0$	$\lambda f(y(t), a, t)\delta(t - t_0)$	R_{jII}
4	$\dot{x} = f(x(t), u(t), a, t)$ at $t \in [0, T]$	$\psi(t) f(x(t), u(t), a, t),$ $\psi(t) = 0$ at $t \notin [0, T]$ $\dot{\psi}(t)x(t) + (x(0)/T)\psi(0)$	R_{jI} R_{jII}
5	$x(t) = \int_0^t f(x(\tau), u(\tau), \tau)d\tau + x_0$	$f(x, u, t) \int_T^t \lambda(\tau)d\tau$ $\lambda(t) = 0$ at $t \notin [0, T]$ $\lambda(t)(x(t) - x(0))$	R_{jI} R_{jII}
6	$x(t) = \int_0^T f(x(\tau), u(\tau), a, \tau, t)d\tau$	$\int_0^T \lambda(\tau) f(x(t), u(t), a, t, \tau)d\tau$ $-\lambda(t)x(t)$	R_{jI} R_{jII}

following form

$$J(\tau)=\int\limits_0^{\bar t}\left[x(t)\delta(\tau-t)-f(x(t),u(t),t)h(\tau-t)-\frac{x_0}{\bar t}\right]dt=0,\quad \tau\in[0,\bar t].$$

From (17) it follows that R_j for this constraint has the form

$$\begin{aligned}R_j&=\int\limits_0^{\bar t}\lambda(\tau)\left[x(t)\delta(\tau-t)-f(x,u,t)(h(\tau-t)-\frac{x_0}{\bar t})\right]d\tau=\\&=x(t)\lambda(t)-f(x,u,t)\int\limits_t^{\bar t}\lambda(\tau)d\tau-\frac{x_0}{\bar t}\int\limits_0^{\bar t}\lambda(\tau)d\tau.\end{aligned}$$

Let us define the function $\psi(t)$ such that

$$\dot\psi(t)=\lambda(t),\quad \psi(\bar t)=0,\quad \int\limits_t^{\bar t}\lambda(\tau)d\tau=-\psi(t),\quad \int\limits_0^{\bar t}\lambda(\tau)d\tau=-\psi(0).$$

We get

$$R_j=\dot\psi x+\psi f(x,u,t)+\psi(0)\frac{x_0}{\bar t}. \tag{24}$$

If the interval $[0,\bar t]$ and x_0 are fixed, the last term in (24) has no effect on the optimality condition.

Other summands in the Tables 1 and 2 are obtained in the similar way. If necessity these tables can be extended for other types of constraints.

Suppose we consider the problem of miximization of one of the optimization criterion listed in Tabvle 1. subject to any combination of constraints from Table 2. We classify unknown variables of the problem as the variables of the first group is they are among the parameters of the functions R_{0I} and R_{0j} for every optimality criterion and every constraint. Thus the optimality conditions for the particular problem of maximization of the criterion I shown in Table 1 subject to any combination of constraints from Table 2 can be obtained by summing up contributions to R from the corresponding terms in these two tables, and then by dividing problem's uknown variables into two groups using the following rule: *the problem's variable is classified as the one from the first group if R_{0I} and R_{jI} for the optimality criterion I and for each of the constraints depend on this variable. All the other unknowns are classified as belonging to the second group.*

We will denote the variables of the first group by $u(t)$ and the variables of the second group by $x(t)$. The problem may have no variables of the first group if, for example, all the variables are linked to each other via the finite equation (row 3, Table 2).

Using the Tables 1 and 2 for each particular problem, we construct the function R as

$$R = \lambda_0 R_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{n} R_\nu. \tag{25}$$

We denote all terms in (25) that depend on $u(t)$ as H. We denote the rest of this expression as N. Thus,

$$R = N(x, \lambda, t) + H(x, u, \lambda, t).$$

Then the Lagrange function for the extended problem becomes:

$$\tilde{R} = N(x, \lambda, t) + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \gamma_k(t) H(x, u_k, \lambda, t),$$

where m is the total number of the conditions of the problem, which contain $u(t)$, $m \leq n$, while the conditions $\gamma_k(t)$ satisfy the relations

$$\gamma_k(t) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{m} \gamma_k(t) = 1. \tag{26}$$

The optimal solution of this problem in the class of sliding regimes is defined as such functions $\gamma^*(t)$ *with components* $\gamma_k^*(t)$ *and* $u^*(t)$ *with components* $u_k^*(t)$*, and also* $x^*(t)$*, such that* $u_k^* \in V$, $\gamma_k^*(t)$ *satisfies (26), while the vector function* $x^*(t)$ *for any* $t \in [0, \overline{t}]$ *can be approximated as exactly as desired by the sequence* $\{x_r(t)\}$ *of admissible solutions (by constraint equations) of the problem such that in this solution the functional* I *tends to its upper bound.* The measure of closeness of the functions $x^*(t)$ and $x_r(t)$ is the value that is maximum on t of the absolute value of their difference.

The necessary optimality conditions in the class of sliding modes are given by the following

Statement (corollary from the theorem 1). *If* $\gamma_k^*(t)$, $u_k^*(t)\,(k = 0, \ldots, m)$, $x^*(t)$ *is the solution of the problem of maximization of the functional* I*, listed in the*

Table 1, over the set of admissible solutions, which is defined by the conditions from the Table 2 in the class of sliding regimes, then there exists a vector function $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_m(t))$; $\lambda_0 = (0; 1)$, *that is not equal zero for* $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$ *and is equal zero outside of* $[0, \bar{t}]$. *For this vector function for almost all* $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$,*and* $\gamma_k(t) \geq 0$ *the function*

$$H(x^*, u_k^*, \lambda, t) = \max_{u \in V} H(x^*, u, \lambda, t), \tag{27}$$

attains its global maximum on u *at* u_k^*, *and the extended function* $\tilde{R}$ *is stationary on* x:

$$\frac{\partial N(x, \lambda, t)}{\partial x} = -\sum_{k=0}^{m} \gamma_k(t) \frac{\partial H(x, u_k, \lambda, t)}{\partial x}. \tag{28}$$

If the problem also depends on the vector of parameters a, *then the conditions of optimality include equations for finding the optimal value* a^* *from the condition that the functional* S *can not be locally improved with respect to* a:

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial a} \delta a = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a} \int_0^{\bar{t}} \left[N(x, \lambda, a, t) + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \gamma_k(t) H(x, u_k, a, \lambda, t) \right] dt \right] \delta a \leq 0, \tag{29}$$

where δa *is a feasible variation of* a.

All the functions that enter definitions of constraints of the problem must be continuous on u and continuous differentiable on x and a. For the existence of the maximum in (27), it is sufficient that the set V be closed and bounded, and that the function H be bounded by u.

4.2. Maximum principle for problems with the scalar argument

In H has maximum on u for almost all t at a single point ($\gamma_0(t) \equiv 1$), then the problem has the solution $u^*(t)$ in the form of the piece-wise continuous function. From (27),(29) it follows that there exists a vector function $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m(t))$; $\lambda_0 = (0; 1)$ that is not equal zero on $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$ and is equal zero outside of this interval. This vector function is such that at almost all $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$, the following conditions holds **the maximum principle for problems with the scalar argument**:

$$H(x^*, u^*, t, \lambda, a^*) = \max_{u \in V} H(x^*, u, t, \lambda, a^*), \tag{30}$$

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial x} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}, \tag{31}$$

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial a}\delta a = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\int\limits_0^{\bar{t}} [N(x,\lambda,a,t) + H(x,u,a,\lambda,t)]\,dt\right]\delta a \le 0. \tag{32}$$

4.3. Examples

Pontryagin maximum principle. As one of the examples of obtaining the necessary conditions of optimality in the form of (30)—(32), we will consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int\limits_0^{\bar{t}} f_0(x,u,t)dt + F_0(x(\bar{t})) \to \max, \\ \dot{x}_\nu &= f_\nu(x,u,t), \quad x_\nu(0) = x_{\nu 0}, \quad \nu = 1,\dots,m, \quad u \in V, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

in which all constraints are in the form of differential equations.

The Lagrange function here becomes

$$R = \lambda_0 R_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{m} R_\nu = \lambda_0 f_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{m} (\psi_\nu f_\nu + \dot{\psi}_\nu x_\nu) + \lambda_0 F_0(x)\delta(t-\bar{t}). \tag{34}$$

Note that the variables u here enter only terms R_{0II} and R_{jII}. Hence, u (controls) here belong to the variables of the first group. There are no parameters in the problem (33) and the optimality conditions (assuming that solution exists in the class of functions $x(t)$ that is differentiable for almost all t and functions $u(t)$ that are piece wise continuous for almost all t) take the form

$$u^*(t) = \arg\max_{u\in V} R(\lambda,u,x^*), \quad \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_\nu} = 0, \quad \nu = 1,\dots,m, \tag{35}$$

This condition, after taking into account (34), can be reduced to the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &u^*(t) = \arg\max_{u\in V} H(\psi,u,x^*), \\ &\dot{\psi}_\nu = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_\nu} = \lambda_0 \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial x_\nu}\delta(t-\bar{t}), \quad \nu = 1,\dots,m. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Here, the function H (Hamilton function) is the sum of all terms in R that depend on u:

$$H = \lambda_0 f_0 + \sum_{\nu=1}^{m} \psi_\nu f_\nu.$$

If we take into account that outside of the interval $[0,\bar{t}]$ $\psi = 0$, then from (36) it follows that $\psi_\nu(t)$ has a break at $\bar{t}$ and

$$\psi_\nu(\bar{t}) = \lambda_0 \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial x_\nu}, \quad \nu = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{37}$$

The conditions (36), (37) are to be solved together with the differential equations (33) and the boundary conditions for x.

The proposed approach to obtaining the necessary conditions of optimality allows us to trace how these conditions change when we add new constraints to the problem. For example, suppose we add to the problem (33) the condition

$$F(x(\bar{t})) = 0. \tag{38}$$

This adds the following term to R

$$\tilde{R}_j = \tilde{\lambda} F(x) \delta(t - \bar{t}).$$

The optimality conditions (36))do not change for $t < \bar{t}$. For $t = \bar{t}$ the ψ_ν is now equal to

$$\psi_\nu(\bar{t}) = \lambda_0 \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial x_\nu} + \tilde{\lambda} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_\nu}, \quad \nu = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{39}$$

The additional variable $\tilde{\lambda}$ is to be found from the condition (38).

F_0 in (33) and F in (38) can also depend on controls. In this case the conditions of optimality do not change for $t < \bar{t}$. But the control $u(\bar{t})$ now obeys weaker condition of local optimality $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}[\lambda_0 F_0 + \tilde{\lambda} F]\delta u \leq 0$, because it turned out that control here belongs to the variables of the second type for $\bar{t}$.

Butkovskii optimality conditions for the problem with constraints in the form of integral equations[3]. For the problem

$$I = \int_0^{\bar{t}} f_0(x, u, t) dt \to \max_{u \in V_u} \Big/ \int_0^{\bar{t}} f(x(\tau), u(\tau), t, \tau) dt - x(t) = 0 \tag{40}$$

the Lagrange function (using Tables 1 and 2) has the form

$$R = \lambda_0 f_0(x, u, t) + \int_0^{\bar{t}} \lambda(\tau) f(x(t), u(t), \tau, t) d\tau - \lambda(t) x(t).$$

Here $u(t)$ is the variable of the first group. The optimality conditions will take the form

$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial x} = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left[\lambda_0 f_0 + \int\limits_0^{\bar{t}} \lambda(\tau) f(x, u, \tau, t) d\tau\right],$$

(41)

$$u^* = \arg\max_{u \in V}\left[\lambda_0 f_0 + \int\limits_0^{\bar{t}} \lambda(\tau) f(x, u, \tau, t) d\tau\right].$$

Combination of differential and integral equations. In many cases, it is more convenient to describe a linear object by a convolution equation rather than by a differential equation. We will show how the replacement of the differential equation (for definiteness, the equation for the m-th differential constraint) by the convolution equation of the form

$$\int\limits_0^{\bar{t}} u(\tau) k(t-\tau) d\tau - x(t) = 0.$$

will effect the necessary conditions of optimality (the maximum principle). Here, $k(t)$ is an impulse transfer function.

Instead of the term $u_m(t)\int\limits_0^{\bar{t}} \lambda(\tau) k(\tau - t) d\tau$ the function H now includes the term $\psi_m f_m$. Similarly the function N now includes $(-\lambda_m x_m)$ instead of $(\dot{\psi}_m x_m)$. The division of the problem's variables between the first and the second groups do not change. The maximum principle here follow directly follow from (30)–(32) and do not require any special derivation.

Problems with the conditions in the form of inequalities and with the maximin criterion. Some of the conditions of a problem may have the form of inequalities. To obtain the optimality conditions using the proposed approach these inequalities can be rewritten in the form of equalities using additional artificial variables. For example, the inequality

$$f(y(t), t) \geq 0 \tag{42}$$

can be rewritten as the equality

$$f(y(t), t) - z(t) = 0,$$

using additional artificial nonnegative variable z(t). The appropriate term in R has the form

$$R_\nu = \lambda(t) f(y,t) - \lambda(t) z(t).$$

The variable $z(t)$ belongs to the second group and does not enter into other terms in R, except R_ν. The conditions of local optimality of R by z (after taking into account that Z is nonnegative and its feasible variation $\delta z \geq 0$) yields

$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial z}\delta z \geq 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\partial R_\nu}{\partial z} \geq 0 \Rightarrow \lambda(t) \geq 0.$$

Here $\lambda(t) = 0$ if $z(t) > 0$, that is, if $f(y,t) > 0$, and $\lambda(t) > 0$ if $f(y,t) = 0$. This is an exact analog of the condition of complementary slackness in the mathematical programming.

For the maximin problem

$$I = \min_{t \in [0,\bar{t}]} f_0(y(t),t) \to \max . \tag{43}$$

we can use the same method by adding an additional parameter a to the problem which is independent of t. Then the problem can be rewritten as

$$a \to \max \tag{44}$$

subject to inequality that holds for any $t \in [0, \bar{t}]$,

$$f_0(y(t),t) - a \geq 0. \tag{45}$$

The criterion (44) and condition (45) contribute the following terms to the function R

$$\tilde{R} = \lambda_0 \frac{a}{\bar{t}} + \lambda(t) f_0 - \lambda(t) a,$$

where (similar to (42) $\lambda(t) \geq 0$, and

$$\lambda(t)[f_0(t, y^*(t)) - a^*] = 0.$$

Here, $\lambda_0 = 1$ if a non-degenerate solution exists. Otherwise $\lambda_0 = 0$. Because all terms in R (except from $\tilde{R}$) do not depend on a and because a is unconstrainted, the condition of stationarity of the Lagrange functional S on a yields

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial a} = \int_0^{\bar{t}} \frac{\partial \tilde{R}}{\partial a} dt = 0 \Rightarrow \int_0^{\bar{t}} \lambda(t) dt = \lambda_0. \tag{46}$$

APPENDIX

Validity of the Lemma 3 follows from the Lemma 1 and the fact that for any solution $P^0(u,t)$, $x^0(t)$, a^0 we can find the sequence of points

$$\{z_i\} = \{u_i(t), x^0(t), a^0\},$$

on which

$$I(z_i) \rightarrow \overline{I^*}, \quad J_j(\tau, z_i) \rightarrow \overline{J_j}(\tau) = 0, \quad i \rightarrow \infty, j = \overline{1,m}.$$

Indeed, for any given t, x, a, τ, the vector $\overline{f} = (\overline{f}_0, \overline{f}_1, ..., \overline{f}_m)$ belong to the convex hull $\overline{Q}$ of the set Q which is obtained by mapping of V_u onto $(m+1)$-dimensional space f. The solution maximizes f_0 with respect to u. Therefore, it belongs to the upper bound $\overline{Q}$ and can be obtained as a linear combination of no more than $(m+1)$ elements of Q (Carathйodory's theorem).

For any solution $P^0(u,t)$ that has the form (13), it is possible to construct the sequence $\{u_i(t)\}$ of solutions of the problem (8), (9) by dividing the interval $[0,\tau]$ into i subintervals $\Delta_1, ..., \Delta_i$ and assuming that $\gamma_\nu(t)$ and $u^\nu(t)$ are constant on each of these intervals. Suppose their values are denoted as $\gamma_{\nu r}$ and u_r^ν $(\nu = 0, \ldots, m)$ correspondingly. We shall call the problem obtained in this way the discretization of the problem (10), (11).

We divide the interval $[0,\tau]$ in the problem (8), (9) in a similar way. But here we divide each subinterval into $(m+1)$ smaller intervals. Thus, we divide Δ_r into $\Delta_{r0}, \Delta_{r1}, ..., \Delta_{rm}$, and we get $\Delta_{r\nu}/\Delta_r = \gamma_{\nu r}$. We assume that the variables $u(t)$ in the problem (8), (9) are piece-wise constant and are equat to u_r^ν on the interval $\Delta_{r\nu}$. For the solutions constructed in this way on each of the intervals $\Delta_r (r = 1, ..., i)$, the values of the functionals I and $J(\tau)$ in the problem (8), (9) are equal to the values of the corresponding functionals for the discretization problem (10), (11). If $i \rightarrow \infty$ then Δ_r tend to zero uniformly in r and I_D and $J_D(\tau)$ for the discretization of the averaged problem become arbitrary close $\overline{I}(\tau)$ and $\overline{J}(\tau)$. Because the problem under consideration in well-posed (definition 2) the same is also true for I and $J(\tau)$. The Lemma 3 is proved.

For the proof of the theorem we use the following statement:

Suppose $y^*(t)$ is the solution of the following problem

$$I = \int_0^T f_0(y,t)dt \rightarrow \max, \tag{47}$$

subject to constraints

$$J_j(\tau) = \int_0^T f_j(y,t,\tau)dt = 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m, \quad \tau \in [0,T], \tag{48}$$

where f is continuous and continuously differentiable with respect to all arguments. Then a non-zero vector

$$\lambda = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1(\tau), ..., \lambda_m(\tau)), \quad \lambda_0 \geq 0,$$

can be found such that for $y = y^*$ the following inequality holds

$$\left(\frac{\partial R}{\partial y}\right) \delta y \leq 0, \tag{49}$$

where

$$R = R_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} R_j = \lambda_0 f_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int\limits_0^T \lambda_j(\tau) f_j(y, t, \tau) d\tau;$$

and where δy is the feasible variation of $y(t)$ with respect to the condition $y \in V_y(t)$.

Proof. For simplicity we assume that $m = 1$. After expanding f_0 and f_1 near $y^*(t)$ and neglecting higher than linear terms we get:

$$f_0(y, t) = f_0(y^*, t) + (\partial f_0/\partial y)\delta y, \qquad f_1(Y^*, t) + (\partial f_1/\partial y)\delta y.$$

Suppose the problem is non degenerate. That is, that $y^*(t)$ is not an extremal of $J_1(\tau)$ for any $\tau \in [0, T]$. Then such value $t = t_1(\tau)$ can be found that

$$(\partial f_1(y^*, t_1, \tau)\partial y) \neq 0. \tag{50}$$

Consider the variation of the solution δy which differs from zero only over two infinitizemal time intervals ϵ_t around $t_1(\tau)$ and the arbitrary $t_2 \in [0, T]$. We denote

$$\sigma_1 = \int_{\epsilon_{t_1}} \delta y(t) dt, \qquad \sigma_2 = \int_{\epsilon_{t_2}} \delta y(t) dt.$$

Variations of I and $J_1(\tau)$ take the form

$$\delta I = (\partial f_0/\partial y)_{t_1}\sigma_1 + (\partial f_0/\partial y)_{t_2}\ \sigma_2, \quad \delta J_1(\tau) = (\partial f - 1/\partial y)_{t_1}\sigma_1 + (\partial f_1/\partial y)_{t_2}\sigma_2.$$

Since the latter expression is equal zero for arbitrary $\tau \in [0, T]$, we can rewrite it as

$$\int\limits_0^T G(\tau)\delta J_1(\tau) d\tau = \sigma_1 \int\limits_0^T (\partial T_1/\partial y)_{t_1} G(\tau) d\tau + \sigma_2 \int\limits_0^T (\partial f_0/\partial y)_{t_2} G(\tau) d\tau = 0 \tag{51}$$

for arbitrary function $G(\tau)$, which obeys the conditions $G(\tau) \geq 0$, $\int\limits_0^T G(\tau) d\tau = 1$, and the variation of the functional I over the set of variations δy, feasible with respect of conditions (51), must non-positive:

$$\delta I = \sigma_2 \left[(\partial f_0/\partial y)_{t_2} - (\partial f_0/\partial y)_{t_1} \int\limits_0^T (\partial f_1/\partial y)_{t_2} G(\tau) d\tau \Big/ \Big/ \int\limits_0^T (\partial f_1/\partial y)_{t_1} G(\tau) d\tau \right] \leq 0.$$

From (50) it follows that the denominator of the fraction in the square bracket is non zero. Denoting

$$\lambda(\tau) = -\left(\frac{\partial f_0}{\partial y}\right)_{t_1} G(\tau) \Big/ \int\limits_0^T \left(\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y}\right)_{t_1} G(\tau) d\tau$$

and taking into account that t_2 can have an arbitrary value, we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left[f_0(y,t) + \int\limits_0^T \lambda(\tau) f_1(y,t,\tau) d\tau \right] \delta y \leq 0. \tag{52}$$

If the condition (50) does not hold then a non-zero function $\lambda_1(\tau)$ can be found such that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left[\int\limits_0^T \lambda_1(\tau) f_1(y,t,\tau) d\tau \right] = 0. \tag{53}$$

Combining (52) and (53) yields the condition of optimality (49), where for a non-degenerate problem we can set $\lambda_0 = 1$.

The problem (10), (11) for the distribution $P(u,t)$ in the form (14) has the form (47), (48), with

$$\overline{R} = R - R_{m+1} = \lambda_0 R_0 + \sum_j R_j - R_{m+1},$$

where R_0 and R_j have the form (17), and the term R_{m+1} corresponds to the condition

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) - 1 = 0 \quad \forall t \in [0,T],$$

which can be rewritten in the form (48) as

$$J_{m+1}(\tau) = \int\limits_0^T \left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) - 1 \right) \delta(t-\tau) d\tau = 0 \quad \forall \tau \in [0,T].$$

Thus,

$$R_{m+1} = \int\limits_0^T \lambda_{m+1}(\tau) \left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) - 1 \right) \delta(t-\tau) d\tau = \lambda_{m+1}(t) \left(\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \gamma_\nu(t) - 1 \right).$$

From the conditions (49) for γ_ν

$$\frac{\partial \overline{R}}{\partial \gamma_\nu}\delta\gamma_\nu \leq 0, \qquad \gamma_\nu \geq 0$$

it follows that for the basic values $u^\nu(t)$ (where $\gamma_\nu(t) > 0$)

$$R(x, \lambda, a^*, u^\nu) = \lambda_{m+1}(t), \quad \nu = 0, \ldots, m,$$

and for $u \neq u^\nu(t)$, $\gamma_\nu(t) = 0$ and $\delta\gamma_\nu > 0$, and, hence, $R(x, \lambda, a^*, u) \leq \lambda_{m+1}(t)$. Therefore the maximum condition (20) holds.

The condition (19) follows from (49) if we take into account that x is unconstrained. The conditions (18) follow from the fact that with respect to the vector of parameters a, the problem (10), (11)is a nonlinear programming problem and S is its Lagrange function.

References

1. *Pontryagin, L.S., Boltyanskii, V.G., Gamkrelidge, R.V.*, Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes, Moscow: Nauka, 1976.
2. *Rozonoer, L.I.*, Pontryagin Maximum Principle in the Theory of Optimal Systems, Autom. Remote Control , 1959, no. 10, pp. 1320-1334; no. 11, pp. 1441-1458; no. 12, pp. 1561-1578.
3. *Butkovskii, V.G.*, Optimal Control of Processes with Distributed Parameters, Moscow: Nauka, 1965.
4. *Gabasov, R. and Kirillova, F.M.*, Optimization Methods, Minsk: Belarus. Gos. Univ., 1981.
5. *Dubovitsii, A.Ya. and Milyutin, A.A.*, Problems for Extremum with Constraints, Zh. Vychisl. Mat. Mat. Fiz., 1965, no. 3, pp. 22-34.
6. *Pontryagin, L.S.*, Maximum Principle in Optimal Control, Moscow: URSS, 2004.
7. *Arutyunov, A.V., MagarilIlyaev, G.G., and Tikhomirov, V.M.*, Pontryagin Maximum Principle (Proof and Applications), Moscow: Faktorial, 2006.
8. *Tsirlin, A.M.*, Solution of Optimal Control Problems on the Basis of Reduction to the Simplest Isoperimetric Problem, Izd. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Tekh. Kibern., 1968, no. 6, pp. 31-46.
9. *Tsirlin, A.M.*, Optimality Conditions of Averaged Problems of Mathematical Programming, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1992, vol. 323, no. 1, pp. 43-47.

10. *Krotov, V.F. and Gurman, V.I.*, Methods and Problems of Optimal Control, Moscow: Nauka, 1973.

11. *Gurman, V.I.*, Extension Principle in Extremal Problems, Moscow: Fizmatlit, 1997.

12. *Yang, L.*, Lectures on the Calculus of Variations and Optimal Control Theory, London: Saunders, 1969.

13. *Fromovitz, S.*, Nonlinear Programming with Randomization, Manag. Sci., 1965, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. 831-846.

14. *Tsirlin, A.M.*, Methods of Averaged Optimization and Their Applications, Moscow: Fizmatlit, 1997.

15. *Tsirlin, A.M.*, Mean Optimization and Sliding Modes in the Problem of Optimal Control, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Tekh., Kibern., 1974, no. 2, pp. 27-33.